

1 A (Witness Weeks) I guess in the sense that almost
2 all things are possible that would be true.

3 Q And in the sense that you're acting as a CLEC in
4 order to gain meaningful information for this Commission
5 about what a CLEC experiences, do you think it's possible
6 there's a process still there that has not been investigated
7 that caused these problems?

8 A (Witness Weeks) The design of the test, for the
9 most part, is to look at CLEC-facing processes, not
10 BellSouth's internal processes. So could BellSouth have
11 internal processes imbedded back in their systems where
12 there are problems? Yes, it could be. If it doesn't visit
13 itself necessarily on a CLEC, we wouldn't necessarily know
14 that.

15 Q Well now these did visit themselves on a CLEC,
16 because a CLEC did not get the clarification or rejection
17 that the CLEC was experiencing, correct?

18 A (Witness Weeks) And the record speaks to that.

19 Q Well, I just want to kind of understand what you
20 just said, because you said you didn't look at the internal
21 BellSouth processes because they weren't CLEC facing, is
22 that right?

23 A (Witness Weeks) We tested the process and our
24 report describes the results of that test. We didn't crawl
25 inside and internally test for xDSL, the internal xDSL

1 processes.

2 Q So, for example, for the first PONs number listed
3 there that was lost for 20 days, that could be lost between
4 the CRSG and the LCSC at BellSouth and that order could, you
5 know, potentially languish there forever.

6 A (Witness Weeks) In the first case we testified we
7 don't remember what the cause, it could very well have been
8 ours.

9 Q Okay. How about the second one? You see
10 something happened between August 11 and September 7.

11 A (Witness Weeks) Yeah, something happened in here
12 that we don't understand or know.

13 Q Could that happen to Covad?

14 A (Witness Weeks) You would have to answer that
15 question.

16 Q Now I believe that you responded -- if you look at
17 the closure report on this same exception, this is Exception
18 117 -- no, I'm sorry, this is BellSouth's amended response
19 to 117. Do you see where it says the documentation has been
20 enhanced to provide additional guidelines regarding handling
21 of clarification/rejection responses? Do you see that part?

22 A (Witness Weeks) Not yet. Where is it, first page
23 or second page?

24 Q Second page of BellSouth's amended response to
25 117.

1 A (Witness Weeks) I see that sentence you're
2 referring to, yes.

3 Q Okay, what kind of enhancements were made to the
4 BellSouth guidelines that address this problem?

5 A (Witness Weeks) This was external -- or internal
6 documentation, not external documentation.

7 Q What does that mean?

8 A (Witness Weeks) This means this is the M&Ps
9 inside the company, not the CLEC-facing documentation.

10 COMMISSIONER BURGESS: Mr. Frey, if you would get
11 up to that mic again.

12 WITNESS WEEKS: The documentation referred to in
13 this case would be BellSouth internal documentation, not the
14 documentation made available to CLECs.

15 BY MS. BOONE:

16 Q So you didn't review any of the improvements they
17 made to any of the internal systems, is that what you're
18 saying?

19 A (Witness Weeks) When we conduct this kind of
20 retest that's based upon response timeliness, our role is to
21 retest by resubmitting transactions to see if the behavior
22 of the system is different. We don't do internal process
23 reviews to satisfy performance-related criteria.

24 Q And do you have any way of knowing whether the
25 same -- strike that. Would you look at -- this is on IV-B-

1 11 and this is POP-12-3-6 and that's on jeopardy
2 notifications.

3 A (Witness Weeks) Yes.

4 Q That's a notification that's given to a CLEC when
5 there's some problem with the facility, is that correct?

6 A (Witness Weeks) That's one of the reasons for a
7 jeopardy, yeah.

8 Q Okay. Now you noted that you were not able to
9 reach a conclusion because there was not sufficient
10 information or a sufficient number of these that were
11 received, is that right?

12 A (Witness Weeks) Not only were there not
13 sufficient, there weren't any.

14 Q Well, that wouldn't be sufficient, would it. Now
15 what steps did you take to ensure that the test bed that you
16 were doing this xDSL testing on was actually reflective of
17 the outside BellSouth plant?

18 A (Witness Weeks) I don't understand the question,
19 could you rephrase it?

20 Q Sure. If a jeopardy notification is triggered
21 when there's a problem with a facility, then that is a
22 problem that's experienced in the real world based on
23 BellSouth's facilities that exist, is that correct, to your
24 understanding?

25 A (Witness Weeks) It'd be our understanding that if

1 the company can't provide a facility that's consistent with
2 that which was ordered, then they could create a jeopardy
3 and send that in and the reason would be facilities, yes.

4 Q Okay, and one of the things they might send a
5 jeopardy notification for is if they got out there and saw
6 that the copper pair was loaded and wouldn't support DSL, is
7 that right?

8 A (Witness Weeks) That would be a condition that
9 might cause that.

10 Q Or if it had excessive bridge tap, it wouldn't
11 support DSL, right? Or if it turned out that it actually
12 ran over fiber and wasn't all copper and the records were
13 just wrong, that'd be another reason for a jeopardy, right?

14 A (Witness Weeks) I assume so, yes.

15 Q So am I to understand that in none of your testing
16 of any of the DSL, you received any jeopardy notifications?

17 A (Witness Weeks) That's correct.

18 Q In the aggregate, how many orders did you submit
19 on DSL?

20 A (Witness Weeks) 208 orders.

21 Q 208 orders total, is that both the first test and
22 the retest?

23 A (Witness Weeks) That's the initial test.

24 Q Initial test. So out of 208 orders, you did not
25 receive one order that had loaded copper pairs?

1 A (Witness Weeks) We did not receive -- we didn't
2 have any working lines. All these terminated in the central
3 office. We were testing the ability to order loops, you're
4 describing a provisioning test.

5 Q Okay. I'm describing a provisioning test. Now
6 Covad wants to order a loop just like KCI did. We submit an
7 order, the response we get is that this is a loaded pair.
8 Are you telling me that that just never happened or it could
9 have never happened under your testing?

10 A (Witness Weeks) Under the design of the test bed
11 for the purposes of the ordering tests, that would not have
12 happened because they weren't working lines that terminated
13 at a customer prem.

14 Q Okay. Well that's the question I was asking you
15 about the test bed. Were there any orders in your test bed
16 that had load coils on them, that had excessive bridge tap
17 or that were too long for DSL, such that you would create
18 jeopardy notifications back to KCI?

19 A (Witness Weeks) Not as part of the ordering test
20 bed.

21 Q As part of the provisioning test?

22 A (Witness Frey) Well, the provisioning test was
23 carried out through live CLEC observations.

24 Q I believe there were 27 of those, is that correct?

25 A (Witness Frey) That's correct.

1 Q Now -- okay, so in the ordering test, you were
2 testing a process of how CLECs are going to order things in
3 a world in which there are no load coils, there are no fiber
4 loops and there's no excessive bridge tap; is that right?

5 A (Witness Weeks) The ordering test is designed to
6 answer the question do the systems that support ordering,
7 the electronic computer systems that support ordering, work
8 correctly or not. We segregate that test from a
9 provisioning test which says does the company adequately do
10 a good job of provisioning orders that have been placed and
11 since for the DSL test, we chose to look at real live CLEC
12 orders in the real world experience, the record on whether
13 or not those kinds of problems that you're raising exist in
14 the real world or not would have been discovered through our
15 provisioning test, not through our ordering test.

16 Q And did you experience any of those in your
17 provisioning test?

18 A (Witness Weeks) The answer is one.

19 Q One out of 27?

20 A (Witness Weeks) That's correct.

21 Q Now I think you might have misspoke because I
22 think you said the electronic systems that support ordering,
23 and you did not measure any electronic pre-ordering or
24 ordering systems --

25 A (Witness Weeks) I stand corrected, I was

1 generalizing.

2 Q I understand.

3 A (Witness Weeks) In the case of DSL, it's only --

4 Q I just wanted to clean up the record there.

5 A (Witness Weeks) My apologies.

6 Q And you did not test any electronic pre-ordering
7 or ordering systems of DSL whatsoever.

8 A (Witness Weeks) That's correct.

9 Q Now with respect -- do you have Exception 126
10 there?

11 A (Witness Weeks) If you'll give us a moment, I'm
12 sure we do.

13 (Brief pause.)

14 Q This is an exception with respect to how often
15 BellSouth actually provisioned a loop on the FOC date, is
16 that correct -- excuse me -- on the due date included on the
17 FOC; right?

18 A (Witness Weeks) Yes.

19 Q Now you said in your first test that BellSouth
20 delivered them 88 percent on time, correct?

21 A (Witness Weeks) Yes.

22 Q Now -- and I believe in that exception it says
23 that you got that information from CSOTS, which is an
24 acronym for something I don't know.

25 (Laughter.)

1 A (Witness Weeks) Would you like us to supply the
2 definition?

3 Q No, it's okay, it's the system for monitoring
4 status of orders for CLECs, is that correct?

5 A (Witness Weeks) That's correct.

6 Q And so you looked on the FOC and you saw what the
7 due date was, is that the process you used? And then you
8 compared it to what was actually put in CSOTS, right?

9 A (Witness Weeks) That's correct.

10 Q Did BellSouth actually deliver these loops or did
11 they just report that they delivered them in CSOTS?

12 A (Witness Weeks) We didn't verify by going to the
13 central office that the loop was physically there.

14 Q Did you verify by going to the customer premise it
15 was there?

16 A (Witness Weeks) These loops terminated in the CO,
17 they're part of the test bed.

18 Q So the only thing that this test measured was
19 whether BellSouth had done -- well, it didn't measure
20 whether BellSouth had done the central office work because
21 you never went to see if they actually did it; is that?

22 A (Witness Weeks) But we have a provisioning test
23 that would have accomplished that.

24 Q Okay. But for this test, you merely matched what
25 they put in their CSOTS records as having been complete,

1 right?

2 A (Witness Weeks) We compared the date returns to
3 the CLEC to the date updated in the CSOTS, right.

4 Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear the last.

5 A (Witness Weeks) To the date in CSOTS.

6 Q To the day that BellSouth put that it had
7 completed the work in CSOTS.

8 A (Witness Weeks) That's correct.

9 Q Okay. And if BellSouth had put that date in
10 wrong, then that would skew your results, is that right?

11 A (Witness Weeks) Either way, yes.

12 Q And if BellSouth hadn't done the work in the
13 central office, even though it was recorded in CSOTS, that
14 would skew your result as well.

15 A (Witness Weeks) It could.

16 Q Now on page IV-S-14, this is getting to the parity
17 evaluation and this is sort of the big kahuna, right?

18 A (Witness Weeks) I wouldn't characterize it that
19 way, but --

20 Q Is this the evaluation in which KPMG tried to
21 discern a comparison between CLECs' experience in DSL
22 provisioning and the BellSouth retail experience?

23 A (Witness Weeks) I don't know that I'd
24 characterize it that way.

25 Q Okay, how would you characterize it?

1 A (Witness Weeks) This was an attempt to evaluate
2 whether or not the process in place to support wholesale
3 operations in the CLECs was or was not at parity with the
4 processes used to support BellSouth's widely defined retail
5 operation, just for DSL.

6 Q Now this evaluation generated a number of
7 exceptions and the first was Exception 108, in which you
8 concluded that the ordering processes were not in parity
9 because retail was electronic, does that sound familiar? Do
10 you have it?

11 A (Witness Weeks) It sounds familiar. We'll grab
12 it here to make sure we're not misspeaking. That's correct.

13 Q Now there was another exception opened because
14 retail had access to what's called LQS which was a loop
15 qualification system for BellSouth, does that sound
16 familiar?

17 A (Witness Weeks) Yes, it does.

18 Q And you closed that exception on the basis that
19 BellSouth had made that system available to CLECs, is that
20 correct?

21 A (Witness Weeks) Yes, that's correct.

22 A (Witness Frey) 107.

23 A (Witness Weeks) 107, yes, correct.

24 Q And is that the correct conclusion of why you
25 closed the exception?

1 A (Witness Weeks) The answer is yes.

2 Q Okay. So we're evaluating the process between how
3 BellSouth retail does it and how BellSouth wholesale does it
4 for CLECs and the first conclusion you reached was that LQS
5 was available to retail and it was not available to the
6 wholesale and that created a lack of parity, correct?

7 A (Witness Weeks) Yes.

8 Q And then you determined that there was parity once
9 BellSouth made LQS available to CLECs, is that correct?

10 A (Witness Weeks) With respect to that part of the
11 process.

12 Q Okay. Now LQS is a system that's devised
13 exclusively for BellSouth, is that correct?

14 A (Witness Weeks) Yes.

15 Q In fact, if a Covad customer -- if Covad does a
16 loop makeup using LQS and BellSouth does not have a DSLAM in
17 a central office, that system will indicate that that line
18 is not qualified for DSL; are you familiar with that?

19 A (Witness Weeks) I'm making sure I follow what you
20 said. I know all the acronyms. Are you asking me if retail
21 places a query through this system and there isn't a
22 BellSouth DSLAM, then it'll come back -- LQS will come back
23 and say that loop is not available for DSL?

24 Q And the CLEC would get the same result, correct?

25 A (Witness Weeks) I assume they would.

1 COMMISSIONER BURGESS: Ms. Boone, we're going to
2 have to break here.

3 MS. BOONE: I'm sorry, I always under-estimate.

4 COMMISSIONER BURGESS: That's fine, no problem.
5 We'll be back at 1:30 to continue. Thank you.

6 (Whereupon, a luncheon recess was taken at
7 1:02 p.m., the hearing to resume at 1:30 p.m., the
8 same day.)

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

AFTERNOON SESSION

COMMISSIONER BURGESS: All right, let the hearings reconvene in Docket 8354-U, investigation into development of electronic interfaces for BellSouth's operational support systems.

Ms. Boone, you'll continue your cross.

MS. BOONE: Do we need to wait for Mr. Hill or -- okay.

COMMISSIONER BURGESS: You shouldn't be asking that question.

MS. BOONE: Sorry. Well, wouldn't want to be accused of doing anything wrong.

FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. BOONE: (Cont.d)

Q We were discussing the parity evaluation that KPMG conducted of xDSL loops. Now, as we mentioned, the first exception you noted was that CLECs did not have access to LQS. And that was cured by providing us access to LQS; is that right?

A (Witness Weeks) Well, I think it was two different things.

A (Witness Frey) Yeah. You're referring to Exception 107, and it goes beyond just access to LQS.

Q Okay. What the other solutions you noted?

A (Witness Frey) Well, fundamentally, the exception

1 deals with lack of parity in access to information on
2 processes that allow for the determination of availability
3 of ADSL capable loops.

4 Q Okay.

5 A (Witness Frey) LQS is one element of that.

6 Q And you concluded that BellSouth had given CLECs
7 access to LQS?

8 A (Witness Frey) Giving CLECs access to LQS was one
9 of the steps that BellSouth took in response to this
10 exception; yes.

11 Q And the second step was that it made an electronic
12 system of loop makeup available to -- to CLECs; is that
13 correct?

14 A (Witness Frey) That's correct; yes.

15 Q Okay. And that's also noted there?

16 A (Witness Frey) Yes.

17 Q Now, did you note the date on which that system
18 was made available, the electronic loop makeup system?

19 A (Witness Frey) November 18th, 2000.

20 Q Okay. And prior to that point, there was a lack
21 of parity with respect to access to information about
22 whether a loop was qualified for DSL?

23 A (Witness Frey) That was our opinion.

24 Q Now, several times in your report -- I'm looking
25 particularly at Roman numeral V-F-16. Several times in the

1 report you state loop makeup is not necessary for retail
2 ADSL. And I want to ask you about that statement.

3 A (Witness Weeks) Would you say that Roman numeral
4 again, please.

5 Q Yes. "F" -- I'm sorry. IV-F, as in "Frank," dash
6 16.

7 A (Witness Weeks) Are you referring to the comments
8 on 16-1-2 or on 16-1-3?

9 Q Correct. Correct. The very first comments on the
10 very -- yes, 16-1-2. You state loop makeup information is
11 not required for retail xDSL pre-ordering; is that a correct
12 representation of your statement?

13 A (Witness Weeks) That's what's written.

14 A (Witness Frey) Yes.

15 Q Okay. Now, that statement is not entirely
16 correct, because BellSouth does in fact do a loop makeup
17 through its LQS system; correct?

18 A (Witness Frey) That's correct, and I believe we
19 state that in the report.

20 Q Okay. I just want to be clear, though, that just
21 because CLECs have to use a separate system that draws data
22 from which they can evaluate whether a loop supports xDSL,
23 that doesn't mean that the BellSouth retail system, however
24 it's designed, is not doing that same process. It is doing
25 that same process. That's the question.

1 A (Witness Weeks) Is the question: Does the retail
2 operation obtain the loop makeup information before orders
3 are processed?

4 Q Yes.

5 A (Witness Weeks) It's our understanding that the
6 LQS request response pair has to have that information
7 before it returns a response to retail, so that the
8 information that would characterize the loop makeup, and
9 BellSouth's internal retail business rules for what
10 constitutes a qualified loop, all that is imbedded behind
11 the scenes in the request response set for retail.

12 Q Exactly. So BellSouth is -- has developed some
13 system that's creating this same type of loop makeup search
14 and analysis in its systems that CLECs are doing through the
15 electronic loop makeup system?

16 A (Witness Weeks) Yes, that's a true statement.
17 They've burned in, if you will, their specific product
18 definitions to their specific information they need to
19 gather about loop makeup so they can give the wrap-up sort
20 of a thumbs up-thumbs down.

21 Q Okay. So it's not -- it's not really accurate to
22 say that loop makeup is not used on the retail side. It's
23 just that it's a different process; right?

24 A (Witness Weeks) Okay, I think a fair
25 characterization -- and I believe this is your

1 characterization, which is correct -- is that from a
2 business process perspective, one must determine what the
3 makeup of a loop is, compare that to the requirements of the
4 type of service that you would like to provision, and to
5 have that comparison made and a decision made whether the
6 loop is qualified or not. That is taking place on both
7 retail and wholesale, and it happens in a different way.

8 Q Okay. Now, the next exception that you issued was
9 Exception 108 regarding electronic ordering. The existence
10 of electronic ordering for retail; the lack of electronic
11 ordering for wholesale; is that correct?

12 A (Witness Weeks) That's correct.

13 A (Witness Frey) Yes.

14 Q And in your closure report on that exception, you
15 noted that BellSouth had, as of February 12th, 2001, made
16 available an electronic ordering system for xDSL loops; is
17 that correct?

18 A (Witness Weeks) That's correct.

19 Q Now, the existence of that system alone is
20 sufficient for you to close this exception; is that -- is
21 that correct?

22 A (Witness Frey) The existence of the system with
23 the functionality as described in the documentation that we
24 reviewed sufficient for closure of that exception.

25 Q Okay. Because this is another one of the process

1 exceptions when you were just looking at how the process was
2 supposed to flow, not whether it actually did work; right?

3 A (Witness Frey) That's correct.

4 Q So you didn't submit any orders electronically?

5 A (Witness Frey) That's correct. It was outside
6 the scope.

7 Q And you didn't -- didn't get any jeopardy
8 responses electronically or FOC dates electronically; is
9 that correct?

10 A (Witness Frey) That's correct.

11 Q Now, you mentioned on page Roman numeral IV-F-24
12 that you conducted a series of, quote, "interviews,
13 observations, and review of documentation." Now, what --
14 who did you interview? F-24.

15 A (Witness Weeks) We're there. The answer is it
16 would be the BellSouth professionals that man the centers --
17 various centers doing xDSL processing for BellSouth.

18 Q And what was the nature of these interviews with
19 respect to the electronic ordering system that allowed you
20 to conclude that the process was sufficient?

21 (Brief pause)

22 A (Witness Frey) The evaluation criterion to which
23 you're referring is focused on examining the execution of
24 both retail and wholesale xDSL orders. And so the
25 interviews that were conducted, were conducted for the

1 process of -- or for the purpose of understanding the
2 processing of xDSL orders. So as Mike previously testified,
3 anyone who touched an order during the process would have
4 been interviewed, or their -- someone who was capable of
5 representing their functions would have been interviewed.

6 Q Okay. So these were not interviews specifically
7 on the newly available ordering functionality, electronic
8 ordering functionality? Perhaps this might be one of the
9 instances in which the subject matter expert could answer
10 the questions.

11 A (Witness Weeks) It includes the whole process,
12 not just the new procedures.

13 Q Okay. Did it actually -- were the interviews
14 targeted -- I mean, did they discuss the electronic ordering
15 system? That's really what I'm interested in.

16 A (Witness Weeks) Yes.

17 Q Okay. And who did you discuss the electronic
18 ordering system with?

19 A (Witness Weeks) People inside the work centers.

20 Q So people at the UNE center, people in the circuit
21 provisioning group, people in the LCSC, people in the CRS?

22 Which people?

23 A (Witness Weeks) The Atlanta LCSC. Yes, Atlanta
24 LCSC group.

25 Q And how many -- and those took place after

1 February 12th but before March 20th; is that right?

2 A (Witness Weeks) Correct.

3 Q And how many CLEC orders, via the electronic
4 ordering system for xDSL, had those people witnessed at that
5 time?

6 A (Witness Weeks) Are you asking about our people
7 or the center people?

8 Q The people that you interviewed, from whom you
9 concluded that the system was sufficient.

10 A (Witness Weeks) Probably less than ten.

11 Q Probably less than ten?

12 A (Witness Weeks) Uh-huh.

13 Q But do you know how many?

14 A (Witness Weeks) No.

15 Q Now, work through this with me. If BellSouth for
16 the first time made available an electronic ordering system
17 on February 12th, 2001, it's your testimony, then, that
18 within the month and week -- the five weeks that followed
19 that period a CLEC built its interface, tested that system,
20 and submitted orders that these people were interviewed
21 about?

22 A (Witness Frey) Beta testing was in process.

23 Q Okay. But the final evolution of EDI and TAG that
24 was released on February 12th, 2001, had not been beta
25 processed -- beta tested prior to that time.

1 A (Witness Weeks) Is that a question?

2 Q Are you -- do you know?

3 A (Witness Weeks) It's our understanding that it --
4 that all that testing had been completed by February 12th.

5 Q All of the beta testing had been completed?

6 A (Witness Weeks) That's our understanding.

7 Q Okay. And do you know how many CLECs participated
8 in the beta testing of EDI and TAG and LENS?

9 A (Witness Weeks) No, we do not.

10 Q Do you know if any did?

11 A (Witness Weeks) The answer is yes, we believe
12 that there were more than one.

13 Q For xDSL orders, I mean.

14 A (Witness Weeks) Correct.

15 Q So in your discussion with these people about the
16 ten CLEC orders they witnessed flow through the electronic
17 ordering system for xDSL, what problems did they note with
18 the system?

19 (Brief pause)

20 A (Witness Weeks) If you'll turn to Page F-4 in the
21 report.

22 Q Okay.

23 A (Witness Weeks) The paragraph that starts, "The
24 Atlanta local service center..."

25 Q Uh-huh.

1 A (Witness Weeks) Describes the nature of the
2 activity that we're doing. We don't recall the specific
3 types of errors or problems that were encountered.

4 Q Okay, I'm reading through that paragraph now, and
5 that appears to me to be a brief recitation of the process.

6 Would that be an accurate statement?

7 A (Witness Weeks) It's the process we witnessed;
8 yes.

9 Q Okay. So, now, how many CLECs did you interview
10 about their experience in the electronic ordering for xDSL?

11 A (Witness Weeks) None.

12 Q Let's turn to provisioning now. Roman numeral IV-
13 C-7. Now, this section deals with your -- KPMG's review of
14 the -- I believe it was 27 orders that you watched
15 provisioned; is that correct?

16 A (Witness Weeks) The number 27 is correct, and
17 we're turning to the page that you're asking us to do.

18 Q Oh, certainly. I'm sorry.

19 A (Witness Frey) IV-C-7?

20 Q It's 4 -- yes, IV-C-7.

21 A (Witness Weeks) Okay, we're there.

22 Q Okay. And is it correct that you observed 27 CLEC
23 live orders installed?

24 A (Witness Weeks) Yes. Yes.

25 Q Now, what's curious here is that you -- it says,

1 quote, "25 installations at the UNE center in Birmingham."
2 Now, you watched them install 25 orders at the UNE center in
3 Birmingham?

4 A (Witness Weeks) This test is under coordinative
5 provisioning procedures, so we were observing the
6 coordination activities that take place.

7 Q What does that mean? I'm sorry.

8 A (Witness Weeks) There's a coordinated
9 provisioning process that this POP 13-2-1 references. So we
10 were observing on both sides the execution of this
11 coordinated process.

12 Q Okay. So this was not the test in which you
13 tested whether the ADSL loops were actually delivered by
14 BellSouth to the customer premise?

15 A (Witness Frey) This is not the evaluation
16 criterion specific to that evaluation.

17 Q Okay. Can you point me to the one that is?

18 (Brief pause)

19 COMMISSIONER BURGESS: Would you identify yourself
20 for the record, please.

21 WITNESS BUJAN: Michael Bujan.

22 A (Witness Bujan) What we did for this particular
23 criteria is, our team was at the UNEC center. And we
24 observed technicians at the UNEC center testing with
25 BellSouth plant technicians, as well as the UNEC technicians

1 working with the CLECs, where they would call the CLEC; the
2 CLEC would do some testing on the circuit; they would accept
3 the circuit; there would be the passing of DMOC information;
4 and the CLEC would give like a serial number and accept the
5 circuit as being a loop that they would -- that they would
6 accept.

7 Q Okay. Can I ask you what the -- the two times,
8 that means you were at -- you were actually at the customer
9 premise with Georgia outside field technicians; is that
10 correct?

11 A (Witness Bujan) That is correct.

12 Q Okay. And did you witness this same kind of
13 cooperative testing with those two instances?

14 A (Witness Bujan) That's correct.

15 Q Okay. And in all of those instances, I think
16 except for one, the loop was successfully delivered; is that
17 correct?

18 A (Witness Bujan) That's correct.

19 Q Okay. Now, how did you get to the 27 orders?

20 A (Witness Bujan) Our testers were in the UNEC
21 center and -- for the 25 orders. We just -- as the orders
22 would come in, as the technicians would call into the
23 BellSouth technicians working the center, our testers would
24 parallel with them as they went through the test and turnout
25 process.